

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 13, 16 and 17 are presently pending. Claims 2-5, 8-12, 14, 15, and 18-22 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 23 and 24 are added.

Each of the pending claims presently stand rejected. Continued Examination is hereby requested.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 13, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of O'Mahony and Magbie.

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "receiving a request for access to the computer network from a client terminal; determining whether a mobile terminal providing a time varying password is within a predetermined location, said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal".

Examiner has indicated "that O'Mahony teaches requesting access to a computer system in col. 2 lines 65+ and col. 7 lines 5+ ... wherein GPS is used to verify correct location - see col.3, lines 15+". Sept. 7, 2006, Final Office Action (FOA), at 2.

O'Mahony is directed to "Geographic Location Receiver Based Computer System Security". In O'Mahony, "The computer system 200 may further be coupled via the I/O bus 230 to a network device 210 for communication with other computers." "The computer system 200 further includes a security system 220 for determining the geographic location of the computer system 200." Col. 3, Lines 4-6; see also, Abstract ("The system further includes a location receiver for receiving a current location of the system.."). "[O'Mahony] Fig. 3

illustrates a block diagram of one embodiment of the security system of the present invention. The security system 310 includes a location receiver 320. For one embodiment, the location receiver is a global position system (GPS) receiver 320." Col. 3, Lines 12-16.

It is respectfully submitted that O'Mahony does not teach both the claimed "receiving a request for access to the computer network from a client terminal;" and "determining whether a mobile terminal providing a time varying password is within a predetermined location, said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal" (emphasis added).

To the extent that Examiner reads "receiving a request for access to the computer network from a client terminal" onto O'Mahony, col. 2, lines 65+, col. 3, lines 15+, and col. 7, lines 5+ it is respectfully submitted that "determining whether a mobile terminal providing a time varying password is within a predetermined location". Note that in O'Mahony, the "The computer system 200 further includes a security system 220 for determining the geographic location of the computer system 200." Col. 3, Lines 4-6; see also, Abstract ("The system further includes a location receiver for receiving a current location of the system..."). In contrast, the claimed invention recites, among other limitations, "determining whether a mobile terminal ... is within a predetermined location" and furthermore, "mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal".

Claims 1, 7, and 16 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from the combination of Arnouse in view of Magbie. Examiner indicated that "Arnouse teaches a card/reader for gaining access to a network to obtain

medical data, said card/chip having an associated reader with associated GPS capabilities. See col. 2, lines 50+ and col 4, lines 20+."

Arnouse is directed to "Method of Secure Personal Identification, Information Processing, and Precise Point of Contact Location and Timing". To the extent that "Arnouse teaches a card/reader for gaining access to a network", "said card/chip having an associated reader with associated GPS capabilities" satisfies the limitation of "receiving access to a computer network from a client terminal", Arnouse does not teach "determining whether a mobile terminal providing a time varying password is within a predetermined location, said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal", because the "(GPS) processor in the identification card" Col. 4, lines 22-23, would only determine the location of the identification card, not the mobile terminal, the "mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal".

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection to claim 1 and dependent claim 6. Since the rejection of claims 7 and 16 is made with reference to claim 1, Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection to these claims, and dependent claims 13, 17, 23 and 24 as well.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims, claims should be allowed. Accordingly, the Application is now in a condition for allowance and Examiner is requested to pass the case to issuance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with any actions requested in this correspondence.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED



February 7, 2007

Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Assignee

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison - Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Voice (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100